

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant notes the Office Action Summary portion of the Office Action indicates that the Specification of the application is objected to. The Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, however, expressly withdraws the previously set forth objection to the Specification, and does not indicate any other reason for objecting to the Specification. Therefore, Applicant believes the indication in the Office Action Summary of an objection to the Specification is merely a typographical error, and, accordingly, there is no outstanding objection to the Specification.

Claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, and 29 are now pending in the application, with Claims 20, 24, and 28 being independent. Claims 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 20, 24, and 28 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, in Figure 21. Thus, Applicant submits the amendments include no new matter.

Claims 20, 24, and 28 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650) in view of Hino (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0036788). Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, and 29 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino and Hertzfeld (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,824). Claims 23, 27, and 29 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino, Hertzfeld, and Ariki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,113,492).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent Claims 20, 24, and 28 so as to clarify the features of the invention that are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits the claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent Claim 20 recites a document printing system comprising, inter alia, “an adjusting unit for making adjustment to expand [an] output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated by [a] second calculation unit.” Amendment independent Claims 24 and 28 similarly recite, inter alia, “an adjustment step for making adjustment to expand [an] output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated in [a] second calculation step.” Applicant submits none of the cited references discloses or suggests expanding an output area into a plurality of pages, as recited in Claims 20, 24, and 28.

The Office Action asserts Cedar et al. discloses a document printing system comprising many of the features of the invention recited in Claims 20, 24, and 28. The Office Action acknowledges, however, that Cedar et al. does not disclose a second calculation unit or a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding a font size to a minimum font size. As Cedar et al. does not disclose a second calculation unit or second calculation step, Applicant submits the reference cannot be taken to disclose or suggest an adjusting unit or adjustment step which expands an output area into a plurality of pages based on an expansion ratio calculated by a second calculation unit or step, as recited in independent Claims 20, 24, and 28.

In order to cure the deficiencies in Cedar et al. with respect to the second calculation unit and second calculation step, the Office Action cites Hino as suggesting a second calculation unit and second calculating step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding a font size to a minimum font size.

Assuming, arguendo, that Hino discloses a second calculation unit and second calculation step as asserted in the Office Action, Applicant submits that the reference still fails to disclose or suggest an adjusting unit or adjusting step that makes an adjustment to expand an output area into a plurality of pages based on an expansion ration calculated by the second calculation unit or second calculation step, as recited in Claims 20, 24, and 28 of the present application.

Applicant submits the further citations to Hertzfeld and Ariki et al. fail to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Cedar et al. and Hino.

Hertzfeld is cited in the Office Action as suggesting a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size, and that both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits an available display area. Assuming, arguendo, that Hertzfeld suggests these features, however, Applicant still submits that the reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Cedar et al. and Hino, in that Hertzfeld does not disclose or suggest the second adjusting unit or the second adjusting step recited in Claims 20, 24, and 28 of the present application.

Ariki et al. is cited in the Office Action as allegedly suggesting that an output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted, with the Office Action specifically citing Figure 7 of the reference, and asserting the figure shows a page that is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted on a CRT or printing device.

Applicant traverses the Office Action's findings with respect to Ariki et al. While Figure 7 of the reference does appear to disclose blocks 33a, 33b, and 33c, of page 32a, nothing in this figure suggests that the blocks are output to a plurality of pages. Moreover, in Applicant's view, the only discussion of Figure 7 occurs at col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 5 of Ariki et al.'s specification. Rather, this passage of the reference merely discusses a number of block on one page. Nothing in this passage, or any other portion of Ariki et al., suggests expanding an output area to a plurality of pages based on a calculated expansion ratio. Thus, Applicant submits that Ariki et al. cannot be taken to disclose or suggest the second adjusting unit or the second adjusting step recited in Claims 20, 24, and 28.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submit the cited references, whether taken individually or collectively, do not disclose or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 20, 24, and 28.

Applicant submits the dependent are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them from the applied references. Thus, Applicant requests favorable and independent consideration of the dependent claims.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DHH/trl

FCBS_WS 2166904v1